

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the very thorough consideration given to the present application. Claims 9, 10, 13, 22, 23 33 and 34 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 35-38 and 40-42 have been allowed. Claims 1-7, 11, 12, 14-21, 25-32 and 39 stand rejected. Claims 8 and 24 stand objected to. Claims 6, 8, 18, 24 and 26-32 have been cancelled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Examiner has objected to Claim 39 as being a substantial duplicate of Claim 12. Applicant has amended Claim 39 to properly depend from independent Claim 35. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that Claims 35-38 and 40-42 are allowed. The Examiner also states that Claims 8 and 24 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant has amended independent Claims 1 and 14 to include the allowable subject matter of Claims 8 and 24, respectively. Therefore, independent Claims 1 and 14 should now be in condition for allowance.

DOCTRINE OF OBVIOUSNESS-TYPE DOUBLE PATENTING

Claims 1-7, 11, 12, 14-21, 25-32 and 39 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-36 of U.S. Patent No. 6,625,193 in view of Smiley. Specifically, Claims 1 and 11 are provisionally rejected over Claims 1, 2, 3 and 8 of the copending application, Claim 14 is provisionally rejected over Claim 18 of the copending application, and Claim

26 is provisionally rejected over Claim 20 of the copending application. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As noted previously, Applicant has cancelled Claims 6, 8, 18, 24, and 25-32 and independent Claims 1 and 14 have been amended to include the allowable subject matter of Claims 8 and 24, respectively. In particular, independent Claims 1 and 14 have been amended to include "wherein at least two of said laser gain medium elements are bonded along their adjacent edges with said material suitable for absorption of amplified spontaneous emission therebetween and wherein said bond is produced by a method chosen from a group consisting of fusion bonding, diffusion bonding and optical contacting followed by heat treatment."

Applicant respectfully submits these features are not taught nor suggested by Smiley or the copending Application, as noted by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant asserts independent Claims 1 and 14 are in condition for allowance and further, Claims 2-5, 7, 11, 12, 15-17, 19-21 and 25, which dependent from independent Claims 1 and 14, are also believed to be in condition for allowance. With regard to Claim 39, it has been amended to properly depend from independent Claim 35. As independent Claim 35 is presently allowed, Applicant submits Claim 39 is also allowable. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office

Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 9, 2004

By: 
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/EKS/ps